



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

V.S.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/900,964	07/25/97	CAPPELS	P2186/757

CARR DEFILIPPO & FERRELL
2225 EAST BAYSHORE ROAD
SUITE 200
PALO ALTO CA 94303

LMC1/0303

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2774	

DATE MAILED: 03/03/99

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/900,964

Applicant(s)
Richard D. Capps

Examiner
Jimmy Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2774



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 25, 1997

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2774

Detailed Action

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informality: claim 1, line 7 “**widow**” should be changed to “**window**” to be consistent with specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sendelweck (USPN: 4,709,267). The claimed invention reads on Sendelweck as follows:

Sendelweck discloses a **synchronizing circuit** (Figure 1, See abstract) (**window generator**) for

Art Unit: 2774

a **video display apparatus** (Figure 1, See abstract) (**display device**), and providing a signal to a **chrominance and luminance processing circuit** (**control device**) which generates input signals and provides processed input signals to video display apparatus (Figure 1, See column 2, lines 9-12). The elements in the claim are read in the reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Santelmann, Jr. (USPN: 5,394,067).

As per claims 2, 3, 12 and 13, Sendelweck discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Sendelweck, however, fails to disclose a **limiter device** to limit the signals to display device as in the present invention. However, Santelmann discloses a **regulated high voltage supply** which

Art Unit: 2774

provides high voltage to the anode of CRT (Figure 2, See abstract) and its **regulator 22** (Figures 2 and 6, See column 5, line 18-31) (**limiter device**), which has the full advantage of limiting the signals to display device as that of the present invention.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the **regulated high voltage supply** taught by Santelmann in a system disclosed by Sendelweck so that the system would offer the advantage of automatically controlled the brightness or limited input signals to display device.

6. Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck, in view of Santelmann, Jr. as applied to claims 3 and 13 above and further in view of Kurisu (USPN: 5,150,107).

As per claims 4 and 14, Sendelweck and Santelmann disclose the invention substantially as claimed but fail to disclose a **processor device** to provide control signals as in the present invention. However, Kurisu discloses a **controlling display device** comprising of a microprocessor 40, character generator ROM 46, pattern generator 50 and control logic 29 which provide control signals including position and size of the desired windows as the present invention claims (Figure 1, See abstract and column 1, lines 18-38).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a **controlling display device** taught by Kurisu in a system disclosed in claims 3 and 13 by

Art Unit: 2774

Sendelweck so that the modified system would offer the advantage of controlling the display of desired images in a window which has any size and locates anywhere on the screen.

In regard to claims 5 and 15, Sendelweck also discloses the video display device such as a **computer monitor** including a cathode ray tube (See column 1, lines 9-12) as the present invention discloses.

7. Claims 6 - 10 and 16 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendelweck, in views of Santelmann, Jr. and Kurisu and further in view of Kato et al. (USPN: 5,724,519).

As per claims 6 and 16, Sendelweck, Santelmann and Kurisu disclose the invention substantially as applied to claims 5 and 15, but do not narrow the control device to a **video amplifier** as disclosed in the present invention. However, a **video amplifier** (Figure 1, See abstract) for amplifying video signals is well known and taught by Kato et al.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a **video amplifier** taught by Kato in the system disclosed in claims 5 and 15 by Sendelweck so that the modified system would offer the advantage of increasing the luminance of video signals on the screen.

Art Unit: 2774

In regard to claims 7 and 17, Santelmann also discloses the regulated high voltage supply generating an **anode load current signal** (See column 2, lines 44-47 and Figure 6) (**analog window signal**) provided for external circuits to sense and use for automatically brightness control or limiting as the present invention discloses.

In regard to claims 8 and 18, Kato also discloses a video amplifier including **gain controller** (Figures 25A, 25B, 26-28, See column 4, lines 55-67 and column 5, lines 1-18) which is used to adjust the gain during the appropriate time period. Kato's gain controller offers the advantage of eliminating direct feedback from the high voltage output completely by providing a low voltage output circuit for feedback having a similar relationship with respect to the high voltage video output stage of the video amplifier, and reducing power dissipation to prolong the life of the computer monitor (column 3, lines 26-34).

In regard to claim 9, Santelmann also discloses the feature of **controlling the anode load current** (column 2, lines 39-47) (**controlling beam current**), which is able to adapt the regulator circuit so that means are provided for monitoring the anode load current so that the brightness of the CRT image can be automatically controlled or limited.

In regard to claim 10, Kurisu discloses a **controlling display device** comprising of a microprocessor 40, character generator ROM 46, pattern generator 50 and control logic 29

Art Unit: 2774

(Figure 1, see abstract and column 1, lines 39-55) (**an application program**), which provides control signals including position and size of the desired windows as the present invention claims. Kurisu's controlling display device offers the advantage of enhancing the aesthetics of screen displays such as menu changes and providing control means to select information for display and to generate a display control signal for controlling the CRT (see summary, column 1, lines 18-55).

Conclusion

8. Sendelweck, Santelmann, Jr., Kurisu and Kato et al. are made of record as disclosing a related system for generating high-luminance windows on a computer display device.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-5422. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2774

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)


(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please

label "**Proposed**" or "**Draft**")

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth floor (Receptionist).

JHN.

February 16, 1999



RICHARD A. HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700